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# A2 Spikes

## A2 Condo Logic

1. The resolution is NOT a conditional statement. It has no “if, then” clauses to it, so condo logic is non-textual. Textuality is key to a) fairness since it divides ground for preround prep, b) jurisdiction since it’s all your given preround to determine what’s aff and neg

Math Goodies:[[1]](#footnote-1)

A conditional statement, symbolized by p q, is an if-then statement in which p is a hypothesis and q is a conclusion. The logical connector in a conditional statement is denoted by the symbol. The **conditional** is defined to be true unless a true hypothesis leads to a false conclusion.

1. Infinitely regressive. If the resolution can be changed into a conditional, then every part of the statement can be morphed into another conditional. This makes it so that there is not starting condition to any statement. There are two implications: a) it is an on face reason to negate because you can’t prove an infinite number of conditions are true. And, b) it is arbitrary to say that the assumption I indict in the NC is sufficient to make the antecedent false--there are other assumptions.
2. Terrible for inclusion of people who haven’t taken logic in math yet
3. Conditional statements must have P and Q as the antecedent and consequent; the res doesn’t

## A2 drop the debater for neg, the arg for aff

1. C/I: Drop the debater for both of us
2. 1. Reciprocity – you win theory but I lose so I can’t check abuse
   2. Strat skew – infinite abusive arguments but I have no time to answer; if I do you go for theory
   3. Time skew – 1ar goes for infinite theory and collapses in the 2a; I can’t weigh
   4. Norms creation – aff’s not held accountable; you also prevent me from engaging, I can never go for metatheory

## A2 Drop the Debater on 1AR Theory

1. Time skew---you get 7 minutes to generate offense on theory while I only get six which means your always going to be ahead
2. 2ar can collapse to either theory or substance so I have to split my time between both, and you can just go for whatever layer I undercover, *(if no RVI) and if I can’t garner offense on the high*est *layer,* *it becomes incredibly unreciprocal bc you have more time to make args on the highest layer, while I can’t even win there.*
3. 1ar theory begs judge intervention since your responses to my counter-interp will be new in the 2a, and I don’t have a 3nr to respond to them, so the judge has to evaluate the validity of your arguments against mine, without necessarily voting on what was on the flow, judge intervention o/w all other fairness claims since without the judge evaluating args made on the flow, the winner of a round is completely arbitrary
4. 1ar theory restarts the debate in the 1a by uplayering which nullifies all the 1n and AC arguments made, kills clash since we can’t actually explore the implications of those args made if aff just goes for a higher layer, clash outweighs other education claims since it’s the unique education we get from debating different positions
5. 1ar theory makes aff a moving target since there are infinite permutations of args in the shell they can go for new weighing for in the 2a, which means I can never know which args to actually spend time responding to
6. I don’t have cx after the 1ar which lets you get away with more sketchiness in your shell since I don’t have the time to ask you about the implications of all the args, and if you extend any sketchy arguments from the shell into the 2a that just proves the abuse since I couldn’t ask about its implication.
7. 1ar theory lets aff get away with super abusive 1a strats since they already have offense on the theoretical layer to weigh against new 2n theory, which judges are already reluctant to buy
8. 1ar theory kills substantive engagement since it encourages a 2n blip storm on theory so that there’s an arg left conceded out of the 2a, killing all substantive engagement since there’s just a blitz of i-meets/turns on theory instead of actually engaging args.

### A2 time skew means you can’t win theory and substance

1. Doesn’t justify why 4 minutes means you can win 0 arguments; if so you’re the worse debater since you’re inefficient
2. Self-defeating – if they win this argument in the 1ar it proves they have the time necessary to win multiple layers of the flow, so the argument is false
3. No abuse
   1. You don’t have to read theory – you can just win substance
   2. Spikes in the AC solves 100% of abuse
   3. Go for preclusion issues – e.g. a) theory’s not a voter, b) K on theory, c) substance o/w theory
4. Impact should be shell specific – let me make new specific arguments in the 2nr

### A2 the 2nr can collapse on aff theory makes it impossible for the aff to cover all of the arguments in the three minute 2ar if they split their time with substance and theory.

1. Incoherent – if I collapse on a c/I to for 6 minutes on theory you win substance??
2. I still have to split my time b/w substance, theory and ballot story
3. I waste time on preemption so a big chunk of my speech is irrelevant – 100% of the 2ar is valid; prefer over arguments about time skews; quality of time matters more since those are the args considered in judges decisions; also since we have the same amount of time so there’s no quantitative skew anyway, if this isn’t true
   1. The AC + the 1ar is longer than the 2nr so I always lose!
   2. The 1ar + the 2ar’s longer than the 2n so I always lose!

## A2 must line by line aff FW

A: C/I – the negative debater may read an overview to the affirmative framework

B:

C:

Critical education – makes us think about the central flaws and interactions between arguments to point out the overarching flaws with a framework, as well as the implication of specific arguments – e.g. general flaws with the theory or flaws with individual justifications, key to education since it makes us question our assumptions.

Time skew – I have to make the same argument a bunch of times if you repeat the same flaw, also harms breadth because we don’t cover a variety of issues if we have the same debate five times on different parts of the flow, key since time shapes ability to make quality arguments that link to the ballot, and substantive education since we can’t apply knowledge on a wide variety of issues in the real world.

Resolvability – things will get put random places since I can’t put them in the underview so it’s unclear how arguments function, key since otherwise judges will intervene and vote based on personal biases instead of picking the better debater, also kills education since we can’t compare arguments since time investment won’t influence judge’s decisions.

Phil education – incentivizes greater diversity of arguments – a) access to general reasons your framework is wrong, and b) indicts for individual arguments, and c) lets us distinguish between argument functions

Interp doesn’t solve abuse – people will just put inapplicable

## A2 one shell only

1. Neg may read multiple shells
2. I meet
3. ***Strat skew****:* I can’t decide where to allocate offense until the 2nr, you can be super abusive in the 1a after I’ve read one shell and then I have no check against abuse kills fairness since I can’t form a path to the ballot and education since I can’t think about argument interaction, next ***reciprocity*** since I need a shell for every time you’re abusive, and you get loads of offense on the theoretical layer, key to fairness; we need equal ways to win. Next ***norms creation*** since we can’t build positive norms off of bad 1ar args.

### TRIX

1. You say “the time crunched 1ar is insufficient to win both theory and substance” – you won substance so you lose theory!

### A2 Can’t Cover

1. If you’re not abusive I won’t read theory
2. Empirical claim w/out empirical warrant
3. Interp doesn’t solve abuse – I can just not read theory and turn the AC for 7 minutes
4. RVI solves
5. K on theory solves
6. 4 minutes of substance before theory solves
7. Read your own shell and weigh

## A2 one unconditional path to the ballot

### O/V

* 1. You violate
     1. You try to get permissibility and obligation
     2. Every shell in the 1AC is a potential pathway to the ballot as is substance

### C/I

* 1. The negative debater may have multiple pathways to the ballot if their 1NC strategy is \_\_\_\_\_\_. \*\*add specific things as to why ur strat is fine\*\*
  2. I-meet
  3. ***Strat skew:*** I can’t know what you’ll go for in the 1ar so could pick the wrong layer in the NC, AND it means you’ll always uplayer and I can’t win, key to fairness since strat ensures that individual arguments can combine to form a coherent ballot story, also kills substantive debate since either I go for theory in the 1NC and the debate is theory, or I don’t and you are abusive in the 1AR and I can’t weigh my shell against either new shells or use it as an out from your abusive strat on substance, kills education since discussion of the topic is the only thing w/ real world application. Next, real world education, I can’t discuss benefits/disads to both of the policies under multiple fws, key to education since application of framework to real world issues is the only way philo has pragmatic implications.

### A2 1ar will undercover

1. No abuse – you can just go for the highest layer, and I can’t collapse
2. No abuse – you can just uplayer in the 1a
3. It’s not inevitable you undercover in the 1a, it means you have bad efficiency, you have 6 minutes to preempt args I could make in the NC so there’s no time skew
4. Btq of what is a necessary part of aff strat, and why capability to collapse kills it
5. T – multiple layers give you multiple outs in the 1a since you don’t have to go for everything
6. T – if you get multiple pathways to the ballot in the 1a and I don’t it makes it significantly easier to win the rd since there are multiple ways to win, whereas I only have one, kills fairness since it becomes significantly easier to affirm than negate

### A2 preclusion bad (key to clash)

1. Interp doesn’t solve abuse – I can just read a completely unresponsive counterplans and turns and you can give a 1 second 1ar by extending fw and saying my offense doesn’t link
2. Interp doesn’t solve abuse – you can just go for preclusive layers in the 1ar
3. Interp doesn’t solve abuse – I can just pretend all my layers are one layer which makes the round really messy– i.e. my contention level offense is an extension of my fw proving that the neg standard is “not to have a living wage.”

### A2 mutually exclusive interps

1. You know what fairness/education are so if I win my interp you could’ve figured it out
2. One interp is truer so just win if what you’re doing is good
3. No link to fairness – this doesn’t matter since norms creation means one norm’s accepted so one side of the binary will die out
4. No abuse – I only read one side of every interp!
5. No reason why drop the arg solves; let me make new responses in the 2n

### A2 time skew

1. No abuse; here’s stuff you could do
   1. Get more efficient
   2. Go for the rvi
   3. Go for a K on theory
   4. Uplayer
   5. Read skep, skep takes out theory and skep affirms
   6. Say substance outweighs theory
2. Time skew negates on theory – 1ar theory is advantageous since you get a 2ar to collapse and I have to preempt everything

### A2 brings round to one layer

1. One layer can be infinitely abusive – uplayering’s key if your unfair

## A2 Neg Interps are C/I

1. Interp has a violation and reasons what you did is bad; that’s why I’m going to read on you; implicitly taking a stance isn’t enough
2. Infinitely regressive – I can implicitly take a stance on things pre round so we can never figure out what are interps/counterinterps – makes the round irresolveable
3. Only way to deter loading the Aff with interps so that if I drop any I lose on face is to hold them accountable to each and every one of them, so spikes must be proactive violations
4. Strat Skew. A. I have to invest time and adapt my strategy to adapt to the AC spikes so there is a proactive violation. B. If it wasn’t an interp they could always put a bunch of abusive spikes, and then when I call them out on it, they’d dump on RVI’s, making it impossible to negate; kills fairness

## A2 redefine under neg T/theory

### Drop the debater dump

1. Rectifies time lost running theory – otherwise debaters can spew abusive arguments, but I have to run theory to beat them back
2. Never solves the original abuse – the arguments on the aff that are abusive are sufficient for you and necessary for me, otherwise you significantly impede my chance of winning and becoming educated in the round, dropping the debater is necessary to ensure arguments are recipricol, k2 fairness since we need equal capacity to generate offense in order to have equal pathways to the ballot
3. Incentivizes debates to spew abusive arguments to bait me into reading theory, kills a) stable advocacy since what you defend changes through round, key to education since it lets us have substantive position comparison and learn about benefits and flaws of our own ideas, also holds us to a higher standard since we have to defend positions for the whole round, also kills fairness since I can’t form a coherent path to the ballot if I don’t know what you’ll defend for the round so I can’t figure out how to disprove you
4. Jurisdiction – you can’t vote on substance if it’s skewed, the abuse happened when they read the arg since I couldn’t form a coherent strat, so voting on substance means you vote for the better cheater not the better debater

### A2 mutually exclusive interps

1. You know what fairness/education are so if I win my interp you could’ve figured it out
2. One interp is truer so just win if what you’re doing is good
3. No link to fairness – this doesn’t matter since norms creation means one norm’s accepted so one side of the binary will die out
4. No abuse – I only read one side of every interp!
5. No reason why drop the arg solves; let me make new responses in the 2n

### A2 time skew

1. No abuse; here’s stuff you could do
   1. Get more efficient
   2. Go for the rvi
   3. Go for a K on theory
   4. Uplayer
   5. Read skep, skep takes out theory and skep affirms
   6. Say substance outweighs theory
2. Time skew negates on theory – 1ar theory is advantageous since you get a 2ar to collapse and I have to preempt everything; you also get access to spikes so there’s greater ability for me to abide to your preference

### A2 brings round to one layer

1. One layer can be infinitely abusive – uplayering’s key if your unfair

### A2 drop the neg on theory

1. Terrible for norms creation – aff can be really unfair but neg can’t, bad for future fair and educational ronds
2. Terrible for reciprocity – you can win off theory but I can’t so there’s infinite abuse on that layer; key since you always win substance since you can’t lose if you’re abusive

## A2 CX Checks

A: C/I: Neg does not have to check theory interps in CX

B  
C:

1. Time skew – I don’t understand the aff until after CX so can’t prep during speech time, key a) computers crash – I need time to pull stuff up, b) CX focus is necessary to understand your position to engage it, c) enables highest quality arguments since I have more time to develop them, key to education since it enables high quality clash forcing us to question beliefs, and fairness since you have time pre round to write counterinterps, so I need time to develop reasons your practices are abusive
2. Topic education – all of CX is comply or conflict so I don’t have time to ask about your advocacy, key to education since explaining arguments ensures we understand them, and fairness since it forces you to be clear about your advocacy
3. Strat skew – a) I can’t read theory mid speech, key to strat since theoretical abuse is only realized through influence on the round, b) check in cx is really vague – e.g. do I need to read full interp or just ask you to cross things off the flow, key to fairness since I need a strat to form a winnable path to the ballot, and education since it makes us think about how arguments interact
4. Norms creation – you’ll stuff the aff with abusive strategies since they’re no risk meaning we’ll have unfair and uneducational future rounds

# Meta Theory

## 1ar theory

### Reject 1ar theory

1. Time skew---you get 7 minutes to generate offense on theory while I only get six which means your always going to be ahead
2. 2ar can collapse to either theory or substance so I have to split my time between both, and you can just go for whatever layer I undercover, *(if no RVI) and if I can’t garner offense on the high*est *layer,* *it becomes incredibly unreciprocal bc you have more time to make args on the highest layer, while I can’t even win there.*
3. 1ar theory begs judge intervention since your responses to my counter-interp will be new in the 2a, and I don’t have a 3nr to respond to them, so the judge has to evaluate the validity of your arguments against mine, without necessarily voting on what was on the flow, judge intervention o/w all other fairness claims since without the judge evaluating args made on the flow, the winner of a round is completely arbitrary
4. 1ar theory restarts the debate in the 1a by uplayering which nullifies all the 1n and AC arguments made, kills clash since we can’t actually explore the implications of those args made if aff just goes for a higher layer, clash outweighs other education claims since it’s the unique education we get from debating different positions
5. 1ar theory makes aff a moving target since there are infinite permutations of args in the shell they can go for new weighing for in the 2a, which means I can never know which args to actually spend time responding to
6. I don’t have cx after the 1ar which lets you get away with more sketchiness in your shell since I don’t have the time to ask you about the implications of all the args, and if you extend any sketchy arguments from the shell into the 2a that just proves the abuse since I couldn’t ask about its implication.
7. 1ar theory lets aff get away with super abusive 1a strats since they already have offense on the theoretical layer to weigh against new 2n theory, which judges are already reluctant to buy
8. 1ar theory kills substantive engagement since it encourages a 2n blip storm on theory so that there’s an arg left conceded out of the 2a, killing all substantive engagement since there’s just a blitz of i-meets/turns on theory instead of actually engaging args.

## Combinations

### Mult Shells + No RVI + C/I

A: If debaters read multiple shells, they may not deny the aff an RVI and claim that theory is an issue fo competing interpretations

B  
C:  
Reciprocity – each shell’s a path to the ballot that can’t be nullified with defense since there’s no reasonability but even if I win a counterinterp I lose since there’s no RVI, kilsl fairness since reciprocity ensures equitability, also kills strat since you’ll go for what I undercover in the time crunched 1ar and collapse for 6 minutes since you have a 6-3 advantage on the issue you go for in the 2n, key to fairness since strat shapes ability to form a path to the ballot and education since it makes us think about argument interaction, also kills clash since you’ll shift out of args I engage, key to fairness since best arguments are chosen through comparison and education since questioning makes us realizes flaws in our ideas.

## CX Checks

### If CX Checks, Must Spec What You’ll Concede To

A: If the affirmative debater claims that they are willing to concede to certain theory or topicality interps, they must specify either a) an evaluable mechanism for determining what interps they will concede to, or b) specific interpretations they are willing to concede to

B:

C:

Strat skew – a) I don’t know what interps you’ll concede to so don’t have time to think about my strat, b) you can have things that are abusive that you wouldn’t kick off the flow that I realize are abusive mid-speech but can’t read theory on, strat’s key to fairness since I need a strat to form a path to the ballot, also education since it makes me think critically about argument interaction, AND, I can’t read theory since you’ll say CX checks solves even if you wouldn’t have conceded the interp, key ground since theory’s my only check on abuse, also solves all your offense; even if CX checks is key to beat back bidirectional interps you can say I ought to CX check those specific issues

Time skew – a) you have infinite time to frontline interps you bite but I have limited time to prep interps, you can know going into round what you’ll concede to but I don’t and can’t use speech time either, kills fairness 1) we’ll have worse norms since you’re better prepped and my position’s less fully developed, also kills education, 2) you have greater ability to make efficient high quality arguments than me so it’s easier to win, b) CX skew – we don’t waste time talking about interps you’ll never concede to so CX is productive, key to fairness since I best understand your position by asking about it, means you’re clear about argument functions so you can’t be shifty later, also key to education since argument explanation makes us fully understand positions

### If Will Concede to Reasonable Interps, Must Concede X Interp

A: If the affirmative debater says that they are willing to concede to reasonable topicality/theory interps, then they must concede [X interpretation]

B:

C:

1. Strat skew – [X] is reasonable since \_\_\_\_\_\_\_, kills strat since I thought you’d concede to it and spent time prepping, kills fairness since I need a coherent strat to form a path to the ballot, also education since time to think about argument interaction forces us to think critically
2. Time Skew – greater ability for you to know preround what you’ll defend, I have less time to prep interps if I must wait until after CX, kills fairness since all arguments can be traded linearly for time, also education since you don’t have to substantively engage my arguments if I drop things based on time contraints
3. Ground – I can’t read theory since you say you’ll defend reasonable interps so you’ll say there’s no abuse, but you wouldn’t have—means you have higher quality ground since you can be abusive and avoid being called out, key to fairness since a) you have an easier path to the ballot, and b) I need theory to check back abuse – key for fair and educational rounds
4. [X] is really fair and educational since \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_; better for substantive engagement if we debate under it for the whole round since a) there’s better norms creation if debaters understand norms are applied, and b) we get access to interp’s benefits in round

## General Spec

### Write down interp text

A: Debaters must write down the full text of theory interpretations before the speech in which they read the interp

B: ☹

C:

1. Stable advocacy – if you don’t write down the text you don’t have one, a) judges and debaters can mishear you, b) extemped planks can be misremembered, c) rebuttals can rephrase the interp to preclude my offense, d) you can be purposely unclear, e) you can realize strategic flaws with the interp during speech and change after. Stable advocacy’s key – a) resolvability – you don’t know if you’re endorsing the better norm if it’s unclear what the norm said, key since irresolveable rounds beg judge intervention, b) strat skew – I don’t know what I need to prove/if I-meet, kills fairness since strat’s key to form a path to the ballot, also education since you can shift out of arguments and we don’t think critically, c) time skew – you know what you defend the whole time but I don’t, key since time shapes ability to communicate arguments, if one has an advantage it’s easier to win.
2. Norms creation – written down interps can be best communicated to others and we avoid them shifting as people talk about them – key since best norms maximize fairness and education in future rounds.

#### X-apply their voter; *fairness is a voter since debate is a competitive activity adjudicated on the basis of wins and losses so no debater should have an advantage, education’s a voter since it’s why people do it and school’s fund it.*

#### Drop the debater – I invested time and altered strat, substance is never fair for me, and deterrence – you won’t do it again so it creates norms.

### Must Spec C/I

A: If debaters claim that theory is an issue of competing interpretations, they must specify what competing interps means in their speech (To clarify: This means that they must clarify if theory should be evaluated based on an offense defense paradigm, and whether it requires an explicit counter interp text)

B  
C  
Stable advocacy – you don’t have one since you can claim C/I means we evaluate based on offense-defense or a defense-offense paradigm or that you do or don’t need an explicit counterinterp. Impacts – a) strat skew – strats differ based on paradigm for theory since different issues have differing importance, key to fairness since strat enables me to form a path to the ballot, and education since it makes us think about argument interaction, b) clash – you delink my offense if it doesn’t fall under the correct paradigm, kills education since questioning makes us realize flaws in ideas and fairness since best arguments are chosen through comparison, which also prevents c) norms creation – we don’t start the debate early on specific paradigm issues, key since it enables future fair and educational rounds d) resolvability – without a clear theory paradigm judges arbitrate randomly, kills fairness since debates aren’t determined on merit

Reciprocity – you get access to all potential meanings of competing interps in your next speech but I don’t get access to turns since you can say certain aspects of it are implicit by piecing together arguments which puts you at an advantage since you know nuances of the initial argument, kills fairness since it enables equitable ballot paths

### Must Weigh B/W Voters

A: If debaters read multiple voters, they must weigh between them in the speech in which the voters are read

B:

C:

Strat skew – a large part of my speech time is nullified since you’ll go for offense to the voter I undercover, but if I go for one and weigh, then you can beat back my weighing and win the other standards since I’ll undercover them, kills fairness since strat enables me to form a path to the ballot, and education since it makes us think critically about argument interaction.   
Clash – you’ll go for what I undercover to avoid offense, kills fairness since best arguments are found through comparison, and education since questioning makes us realize flaws in ideas.

Norms creation – most important issues should be prioritized earliest in round to find the best norms, key since it enables future fair and educational rounds, o/w a) longevity – norms impact debaters in all future rounds, b) magnitude – this round’s already skewed but future one’s can be 100% fair and educational from the getgo, c) scope – all people in the community are impacted, not just us in round

## Spikes

### Full Shell Format

A. Interpretation: all theoretical interpretations in the AC with potential ballot implications must be read in the form of a preemptive shell with a prewritten interpretation, potential violations, reasons to prefer the interpretation, internal links from standards to voters, written out voters, punitive implications, and framing of what paradigm to use, i.e. competing interps or reasonability. *These interpretations must be together in one section of the case and numbered-you cannot have multiple offensive arguments hidden under a single number.*

B. Violation:

C. Stratskew.

A. no risk theory-if I drop a spike in the NC because I don’t think I link, the 1AR can make nonsensical violations that become no-risk. Any risk of me violating is a voter, so I can only win by proving 100% terminal defense on an I meet, I’m always way behind on the theory debate. My interp solves since you have to explain potential violations so I know what to avoid doing.

B. having the spike as a prewritten shell ensures I know exactly what each part of the interp’s implication is-it's comparatively harder to point out and refute all the implicit assumptions without a structured shell, and I can't weigh against theory arguments in a non-theory format. All this skew to theory ground is loss of essential ground since theory directly implicates the ballot-means this outweighs substantive skew.

C. without specifying paradigm issues, you’re way ahead. 1. I can’t attach an RVI in the 1NC since you don’t specify drop the argument or debater-that’s unreciprocal since you can always read an RVI in the 1AR-you get access to a whole layer that I don’t get. 2. Skews my time allocation responding to spikes-if its drop the debater then I will cover the spikes more deeply but drop the arg then it’s not as big of a deal, also specifying competing interps or reasonability because otherwise I don’t know if I need offense to a counter interp or just defensive arguments. *Numbering and separation is key-making them unordered and disorganized detracts from my ability to catch them and be able to answer them-incentivizes hiding arguments just for the purpose of extending them as easy wins. Kills clash and education because you’ll avoid substantive debate by just trying to win off of hidden arguments.*

Stratskew kills fairness since we both need coherent strategies to win the ballot.

And, there’s no strategy loss to the aff:

A. if a full shell is too much for the 1AC you can just read theory in the 1AR if I’m abusive-also better for your strat since developed shells are more likely to win since judges will vote on 1AR theory but not always blippy spikes, and I don’t have as much prep time to respond in the 2N so you’re comparatively ahead.

B. Just need extra components to make them work-since you are willing to invest so much time in the AC on spikes regardless, the few extra hoops should not be problem. Huge strength of link mitigation on the offense you can get there.

### Disclose Spikes

A: Debaters must disclose spikes on the NDCA wiki before reading them

B  
C:

Norms creation – a) I can prep for a position that meets all your spikes; some might require me to do prep so I need an advance notice on interps you want me to meet, also key to fairness since prep skew makes it harder for me to access high quality arguments that form a path to the ballot, and means 1) disclosure solves your abuse story – I’d meet them if I could, 2) offense on your spikes is offense for me; my interp’s the only way your norms are enforceable b) public norms lets people in the community accept your norms if they’re good, c) I have more prep time to think of benefits and flaws with your position, key to education since it enables greatest clash which lets us realize flaws in beliefs by questioning them, and fairness since best positions win based on merit not shock value since spikes are usually blippy d) check against bidirectional spikes which make it unclear what norms we should follow, norms creation is key since it enables maximally fair and educational future rounds

### Separate and Number Spikes

A: Debaters must number and separate all spikes

B:

C:

1. Flowabilility – numbered and separated spikes are key to keeping track of blippy args, key to fairness since 1) otherwise judge’s can’t keep follow and vote arbitrarily, 2) I can’t engage your norms since I can’t prewrite responses which means that you can’t leverage spikes since we don’t know if they’re true, also kills education since if there’s no way to substantively compare norms worse ones are followed, and we don’t clash and thus can’t think critically by questioning our beliefs – numbering and separating solves since each norm is clearly divided and numbering enables signposting, 3) Aff always wins since later debates frame what was said in round and judges can’t reference flows if aff misrepresents– flowability outweighs everything; a) jurisdiction – arguments can’t be attributed to the better debater if they’re not debateable, b) engagement – doesn’t matter if your arguments are fair or educational if they don’t have a link to the ballot and can’t be discussed, c) strength of link – I have NO ability to engage your positions so you can be infinitely abusive

**A2 “Explain what argument was when you answer it”**

1. T – worse discussion of norms; I have to give judge time to a) locate the argument, and b) fully understand what I’m talking about so there’s less time to discuss merits of a specific spike
2. T – you’re at a time advantage since you’re better acquainted with your position
3. T – proves abuse; you’re not held to your initial presentation of the argument but rather my re-explanation of it so they don’t vote based on actual arguments made
4. T – puts me at a disadvantage; either I signpost well so judge can flow me and then I spend more time explaining your arguments so they’re more familiar with them and) more likely to vote off them, since I number my own responses, AND you then have to spend less time signposting so have a greater amount of time to win, OR, I signpost just as badly and the round becomes irresolveable
5. Doesn't solve abuse – you didn’t delineate arguments so I can’t concisely explain the story behind a spike since there is none

### Converse Spikes Must Spec Converse

A. if the aff claims the negative must defend the converse of the resolution, they must clarify in the original interpretation in the AC a list of possible violations of the interp.

B.

C. Stratskew. If I drop the spike in the NC because I think I’m defending the converse, the 1AR can make nonsensical violations that become no-risk. Any risk of me violating is a voter, so I can only win by proving 100% terminal defense on an I meet, I’m always way behind on the theory debate. My interp solves since you have to explain potential violations so I know what to avoid doing. Supercharged in this instance-the word converse is super vague and LD has adopted a misconception of what it means.

Math Words (an interactive online math dictionary) “Converse” http://www.mathwords.com/c/converse.htm

Converse: Switching the hypothesis and conclusion of a conditional statement. For example, the converse of "If it is raining then the grass is wet" is "If the grass is wet then it is raining." Note: As in the example, a proposition may be true but have a false converse.

Also causes 100% ground loss since if you just extend your spike with the true meaning of the word then there is no possible way to negate because the resolution isn’t a conditional statement, so there’s *no way* to prove its converse and affs win 100% of rounds.

And, even if converse is supposed to mean “opposite,” it is still unclear what I have to do. Do I have to defend just prohibition, does that allow me prefiat Ks or theory, or a topical CP? Kills fairness since you can change the function of the spike since it’s unclear in the AC based on the NC strategy.

And, specifying in the AC is key because I have to formulate a 1N strat based on the arguments you make-most of my strategic decisions happen while the aff is being read.

## RVI

### RVIs on I meets Bad

A. Interpretation: debaters can only claim an RVI for offense to a counter-interp, not an ‘I meet’.

B. Violation: they said in the aff they get RVIs on I meets.

C. Standards:

1. Reciprocity. I can only win the theory debate by proving my interp is good-RVIs on I meets gives you an infinite number of no risk NIBs. You can make a lot of sketchy and semantic I meets-I have to beat all of them back or I lose. And, it’s easier to prove you meet than you violate since you can only violate an interp in a few limited ways but you can meet it for hundreds. Key to fairness since it ensures no debater has a structural advantage.

2. Substantive clash. Under your interp the entirety of the debate’s focused on theory, whereas in mine if you meet the interp we can still have a substantive debate. Substantive clash is key to education since theory doesn’t teach us things for the real world, but engagement on other relevant layers promotes portable skills.

3. Proportionality – RVIs on I meets overcompensate for abuse; I’ve already put myself at a disadvantage if I read a full shell you don’t bite. Proportionality’s key since fairness requires undoing the right amount of harm – e.g. if I steal your sandwich, you shouldn’t steal my house to make things fair.

4. Norms creation – incentivizes theory debates where we talk about the best rules in the activity, key to fairness and education since it allows future rounds to have the best norms.

### 2NR RVI Bad

A: All neg warrants for RVIs must be in the 1NC. They violate if they read a 2NR RVI.

C:

Prefer: A. Clash-initiating the RVI earlier ensures a more nuanced debate about the benefits of giving it to you. Starting it in the 2NR means we get no clash and we might set bad norms for the round and make the wrong theory decision; clash is key to education since it makes us question assumptions, and fairness since best arguments are chosen through comparison. B. stratskew- 1) the 2AR is too short to cover a neg RVI dump and win substance so you make it impossible to form a coherent strat, 2) aff doesn’t know what you’ll collapse to so the 1ar doesn’t know how to allocate, 3) I have to waste time preempting since judges have different feelings on new 2ar arguments so your prep time is more valuable; key since without a path to the ballot I can’t win. C. Resolvability – new 2n and 2a stances on paradigm issues become muddled since it’s hard to resolve competing conceded arguments without a speech for weighing on both sides, key to fairness since otherwise judges vote arbitrarily, not for the better debater

### 2ar RVI bad

A: Aff may not take a new stance on RVIs in the 2a.

B: This is an offensive – if they go for RVIs bad in the 2a, they violate.

C:

1. Strat skew--Aff can collapse to either theory or RVIs bad in the 2a, meaning I have to split my time evenly since they can go for what I undercover, killing clash because we can’t have a good theory debate if we can’t go in depth into one issue
2. I have no 3n to respond to new 2a RVI justifications which means their new args beg judge intervention because the judge has to evaluate from their own perspective whose args are better since the args cant be fully engaged. If they respond to this very argument that just proves the abuse.
3. Clash—no clash on the RVI debate if they just get to go new in their next speech and I don’t get to engage their args, k2 reciprocity since they get
4. Resolvability – new 2a stances on paradigm issues become muddled since it’s hard to resolve competing conceded arguments without a speech for weighing on both sides, key to fairness since otherwise judges vote arbitrarily, not for the better debater
5. Jurisdiction – new 2ar arguments can’t be attributed to the better debater since they can’t be debated since I don’t have a 3n – key since jurisdiction determines how you’re obligated to vote

### RVI Bidirectionality

A. Interpretation: if debaters warrant an RVI, they must explicitly say that it applies to both debaters in cross-ex.

B. Violation:

C. Standards:

1. Reciprocity. If you get an RVI but I don’t necessarily then you can read as many shells as you want, they’re all no risk issues but if I decide to call you out on abuse then you can just slam me with your counter interp and extend and weigh your shells. Key to fairness since otherwise you have more access to the ballot. Even if I’m able to warrant it, that’s terrible for my strategy since they can dump on it in their next speech and say RVIs only apply to their side specifically.

2. Substantive education. No risk theory incentivizes lots of frivolous shells since there’s no strategic disadvantage to reading them. Key to education since theory doesn’t teach us things for the real world, but engagement on other relevant layers promotes portable skills.

3. Clash – forces debaters to uplayer or read new shells instead of answering the initial one since you can’t win on the initial shell, kills education since clash lets us realize faulty assumptions, and fairness since argument evasion means you can’t evaluate who’s best at issue comparison

4. Strat skew – you can leverage args for aff RVIs as only aff RVIs in the next speech, kills strat since forming a path to the ballot lets me win.

### Must Spec RVI Conditions

A. Interpretation. If debaters claim they get an RVI, they must specify in their speech the conditions under which it can be triggered. (To clarify, whether the RVI requires offense to a counter interp vs. I meets, drop the argument vs. debater, competing interps vs. reasonability.)

B. Violation: they just said they get an RVI without specifying conditions.

C. Standards:

1. Shiftiness. If I don’t know when you get an RVI then I don’t know under what conditions I should read theory – it’s net preferable to clarify so I can decide to preserve my strat; key to fairness since I need a path to the ballot to win.

2. Ground. You always have an advantage on the RVIs good/bad debate if it’s generic – best arguments are about why specific conditions on the RVI are abusive – e.g. on I meets, or how it doesn’t apply to drop the argument. Ground is key to fairness because we both need arguments to win the round; also harms reciprocity since you get access to arguments but I don’t get access to indicts, kills fairness since we need equal paths to the ballot to win.

3. Norms creation. We can discuss specific paradigms for theory – otherwise you can coopt my offense; key to education and fairness since best norms on theory let us enforce the best rules in debate.

## Spec Bad

### Interp

A: The negative debater may only read theory shells about things that the affirmative debater did not specify after they’ve either a) asked in CX or flex prep for the affirmative debater to specify\_\_\_\_. To clarify, you may only read theory if the affirmative debater refuses to specif, or b) disclosed their interpretation on the NDCA wiki at least 10 minutes before the round.

B: They did

C:

*Culpability* – there’s an infinite number of things it would be preferable for me to spec so I’m always at a disadvantage on theory; also your interp justified spec as a good principle but specing certain things trades off with others so you should clarify what you want – culpability is key a) I didn’t make the round abusive so dropping me is disproportionate, which means you violate your shell b)theory can’t function to set norms if I’ll lose regardless of my in round strat. This is also key to predictability - I can never prep out or meet theory if you have infinite ground, key to fairness since predictability constrains ability to make high quality arguments and form a path to the ballot, also education since you can shift out of substantive topical debate which lets us learn about real world conflicts. Next is substantive education– spec shells mean that I have to spend the whole aff clarifying random planks to get out of theory so we never debate the topic, you also get bidirectional shells – kills education since topics give us knowledge on real world issues.

### Extensions

Extend culpability – there’s an infinite amount to spec – you should clarify specific concerns. This hijacks all your reasons spec is a good thing and outweighs – even if this interp is best for you, different people find certain things more fair or educational, so I maximize benefits in all rounds.

a) I didn't make the round abusive – that means I don’t violate theory but you do, since you made the round abusive by failing to spec – it’s not an issue of not spec-ing this in general, but that you find it unfair, so it’s your prerogative to ask, b) theory can’t function to set good norms – people will potentially be infinitely abusive which outweighs everything and controls the intenral link to your offense – even if your interp is a good ting, no one will follow norms. Norms creation outweighs, a) longevity since it impacts all future rounds, b) scope since it impacts the debate community, and c) magnitude since the round starts out maximally fair or educational instead of attempting to make up for abuse halfway through.

Extend predictability – it’s impossible for me to meet or answer your shell, that outweighs, 1) if I always lose theory then there’s a structural skew that’s impossible to overcome, but you can do better debating to overcome substantive disadvantages. 2) Theory abuse also outweighs since theory’s a game over issue.

Extend substantive education – we will never debate the topic if you read spec shells, topical education’s the most important – a) we only have 2 months to learn about it, b) it’s directly applicable to the real world since it discusses political conflicts

### A2 Theory Ed = Good

1. This isn’t offense for you – you can read other theory so it’s not a disad to my interp
2. T – this type of substantive theory is bad since you’ve conceded predictability – I can’t respond so we can’t have a theory debate
3. T – disclosing on the wiki means better theory debates since I can do prep against the interp if I decide not to meet it
4. T – spec shells are intellectually bankrupt – you just copy and paste the same standards about stable advocacy into new shells – I encourage you to read nuanced shells which lets us think critically

### A2 CX Issues

1. Fine – disclose all your interps on the wiki. Solves 100% of abuse – you have no offense.
2. non-unique – if a judge doesn’t flow cx, they might miss a speech
3. t – cx is slower so judges will be more likely to catch what you say
4. no abuse – you can ask the judge to pay attention or force your opponent to write something down on a piece of paper – this solves back stable advocacy

### A2 “This is just a C/I”

1. Counterinterps are permissive – this is a rule
2. Only interps have violations
3. If I have offense about why what you did was bad then theory’s offensive for me: you should lose for your practice
   1. Reciprocity – I waste time justifying a counterinterp to your shell even though it’s a harder thing to prove so I have a double burden since I have to read metatheory, if it’s not a voter for me I have to do twice as much but have no path to the ballot
   2. These shells detract away from substance – we should deter people from reading them

# Aff Specific Shells

## Whole Res Affs Must Provide Definitions

1. Interpretation: On the \_\_\_/\_\_\_ 2015 topic, if the aff defends the entirety of the resolution, then they must clarify the scope of the resolution by defining \_\_\_\_\_ with evidence in the AC.
2. Violation:
3. Standards
   1. Saying you defend whole res is meaningless unless you contextualize its scope; defining \_\_\_ is key because it clarifies the scope of that action and all the topical affs it envelopes. Impacts: 1) resolvability- a) round devolves to competing assertions of what offense links which forces the judge to make an arbitrary brightline and exclude arguments based on intuitions, b) you defend contradictory things; kills fairness since judges vote randomly, also education since we can’t compare without a metric, 2) stable advocacy- 1AR can clarify to exclude turns; definitions are key since I hold you to one interpretation. Otherwise every 1AR is incentivized to exclude neg offense- forcing a 2NR restart. Kills a) strat – I have to leverage offense under different definitions and most of the NC’s nullified, kills fairness since it lets me form a coherent ballot path, also education since we think about interaction, b) clash – you delink turns, kills education since questioning makes us realize assumptions, and fairness since best arguments are picked through comparison

And – CX doesn’t solve: a) time skew – vagueness in advocacy means you get infinite pre round prep to determine your position but I can’t prep during speech which also kills my CX time since I can’t question nuances of the position if I don’t understand it so I’m at a disadvantage since it’s harder to engage, outweighs time reading your advocacy in the 1AC-that takes seconds whereas a line of questioning can last minutes, b) resolvability – many judges don’t flow CX or do badly so advocacy specificities which can be complex aren’t caught and you can be shifty later

1. Voters

Vote on fairness, Judges must vote for the better debater – they can’t if rounds are skewed. Vote on education-it’s why schools fund debate, people do it, and it provides portable skills.

Drop the debater to: A. Set a positive norm, B. Deter future abuse, C. Rectify time lost running theory

Competing interps since 1. Reasonability causes a race to the bottom, but competing interps maximizes fairness and education. 2. Reasonability collapses to competing interps-you use an offense-defense paradigm to determine reasonability which cedes the authority of competing interps.

*No RVIs. 1. Illogical. Just since you are fair doesn’t mean you should win, otherwise both debaters would win fair rounds automatically, which would be irresolvable, and resolvability comes first since every debate needs a winner. 2. Chilling effect. Either I read theory and you beat me with your 4 minute prep out or I don’t read theory and abusive practices prevail-both kill fairness. 3. Topical clash. RVIs kill substantive debate. Once theory is initiated we can never go back to substance, since it’s unnecessary so nobody will engage in the topic. 4. Norm setting. I can’t concede that the counter-interp is better even if I come to that realization in the middle of the round, so the RVI forces debaters to argue for bad debate practices, which is inimical to the most fair and educational interps in the long run.*

### A2 CX clarification:

1. T – Abuse is supercharged- you’re incentivized to create arbitrary brightlines; worse abuse since you can tailor the advocacy perfectly to exclude neg offense. Definitions backed by evidence check back because they ground your advocacy with an actual source, stops utopian fiat.
2. T – flowability; I understand the position as it’s read under a filter, ex post facto rules mean my preflowed responses don’t matter

### A2 Potential Abuse:

1. it’s real abuse- because I didn’t know what offense would link to your aff, the NC strat was already skewed, I had to exclude certain answers that would have applied if you clarified the scope of your aff
2. potential abuse is still a voter under competing interps

# Plan Specific Shells

### Spec Funding

A: If running a plan, debaters must specify a funding mechanism

B: They do not

C:

Real world education – a) turn ground – you kill it if I don’t know plan’s tradeoffs; key to fairness since skewed ability to generate offense means winning is easier for one debater, b) cp ground – you preclude counterplans that can compete since funding’s limited – key to education since it lets us analyze the full context of specific policies, also fairness since it precludes my ability to get highest quality objections to the plan so you’ll win even if it’s not a good idea. Next is governmental education – talking about how policies are passed is key since it lets us learn about intricacies of government – key since it lets us translate policy education into real world action making our debate skills applicable. Next is precision – different authors have different analysis of tradeoffs depending on what the mechanism is – kills my access to turns that interact best with the plan, killing policymaking education since we don’t accurately evaluate the policy – authors for my turns can be inconsistent aff authors. Next ground – it ensures aff doesn’t have a utopian fiat since it ensures it’s feasible -- key to fairness since it ensures a) presence in the lit and access to good arguments on both sides, b) real world education since plan specific education is applicable to real world possibilities, and c) ground – ensures you don’t have higher quality ground since the policy seems good in principle but not in practice since your authors can fiat perfection. Next strat skew – you can delink turns by shifting what the aff defends, key to fairness since strategies enable arguments to form a pathway to the ballot

### If plan 🡪 util

1. If debaters read a plan, they must read a utilitarian framework
2. They read a plan + \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_; this is not util

Ground – you get access to narrow frameworks that filter out potential neg impacts and you can parametricize to choose the best area of the topic, meaning I have lower quality of ground and you can fiat perfection – util is fairer then other frameworks since it evaluates all impacts; e.g. freedom violations can be bad under it, but consequentialist impacts are also morally relevant, it’s just a question of weighing, key to fairness since equitable ground shapes ability to form a path to the ballot, and education since it gives both debaters capacity to critique each others ideologies. Next limits – you underlimit the topic since you have any choice of framework and advocacy util solves since governments use it – it’s most predictable

Goodin[[2]](#footnote-2)

Consider, first, the argument from necessity. **Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty**, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. **Public officials**, in contrast, **are relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates**. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices. But that is all.**That is enough to allow public policy-makers to use the utilitarian calculus** – assuming they want to use it at all – **to choose general rules of conduct**. Knowing aggregates and averages, **they can** proceed to **calculate the utility payoffs from adopting each alternative possible general rule**. But they cannot be sure that the payoff will do to any given individual or on any particular occasion. Their knowledge of generalities, aggregates and averages is just not sufficiently fine-grained for that.

Key to a) research burden – if one debate has much greater access to research they can make higher quality arguments inhibiting 1) most educational argument comparison based on evidence, and 2) equitable ballot access.

### Plans disclosed on the wiki must be real

A: Plans disclosed on the wiki must be real

B: They couldn’t pull it up on their computer/this isn’t a plan!

C:

Prep skew – I have to prep against [x #] of affs but you only have to prepare a subset of that, key to fairness since prep on plans debates requires good evidence – you’ll find better stuff if you have to prep less so your arguments will be better, also education since I don’t get to focus knowledge on one relevant issue. Also kills education since a) I’ll go for stock preclusion arguments instead of engaging the plan since I know you’re at a prep advantage, b) wiki loses meaning so people don’t look to it for prep since they know people take advantage and we can’t substantively engage specific plans, key to education since we can clash and compare ideas on one central issue.

### If Plan 🡪 No EM

A: If debaters read a parametricized advocacy, they must defend epistemic confidence. (To clarify: you can’t read a plan and epistemic modesty)

B: They read a plan of \_\_\_\_

C:

Ground – you’re better researched on the plan since I must prep case negs to a variety of affs but you prep one, but I can’t go for generic framework preclusion since your offense matters under the NC, key to fairness since ground constrains ability to argue and win; higher quality ground makes it easier for oyu, and education since it gives us equal paths to engage each other

Predictability – we don’t discuss general underlying philosophical questions of the topic since general contention level offense is excluded AND I can’t go for framework so you go for circumstance specific offense that doesn’t prove the res true as a general principle which also means you negate AND that I’m at a huge prep disadvantage since I don’t get generic disads against nuanced aff, key to fairness since it shapes ability to make best in round arguments, and education since best arguments are supported by a background knowledge.

# Framework

### Must read standard text

A: Debaters must read a standard text

B:

C:

Stable advocacy – you have no framework you’re bound to defend and can piece together arguments to form a ballot story later, kills a) clash – piecing together arguments to implicate framework’s gets you out of indicts and offense, you’re also incentivized to write an incoherent framework that can mean different things since I can’t point that out if you’re not held to one conclusion, kills education since questioning makes us realize flaws in ideas, and fairness since best arguments are chosen through comparison, also phil education if your framework’s incoherent – key to education since it shapes how we decide to act b) strat skew – I can’t form a strat if I don’t understand your position, key to fairness since it’s how I form a path to the ballot, and education since it makes us think critically about argument interaction, c) resolvablity – unclear how aff evaluates offense, kills fairness since judges vote randomly not on merit. C) time skew – you get infinite pre round prep to understand framework but I have to wait until after speeh

AND – a text’s preferable to CX

1. Resolvability – 1) many judges don’t flow, 2) debaters can be vague, 3) framework texts can be long, 4) we don’t know if you’d have spec-ed in CX so it’s not verifiable

### If Deont + Presumption 🡪 Weighing Mechanism

A: If debaters read a deontological standard and claims presumption ground, they must specify a weighing mechanism under their framework that clarifies how to resolve multiple competing obligations

B:  
C:

Stable advocacy – no concrete concept of what happens when I turn the NC so you can delink turns, piece together conceded arguments to preclude, or claim we can’t weigh and trigger presumption, impacts – a) strat skew – you can collapse to what I undercover so I need offense under both frameworks so you can’t sit on framework comparison for [ ] minutes, but I can’t impact turns back and you’ll always have an advantage since you know intricacies of the position, key to fairness since strat lets us form a path to the ballot, and education since it lets us think critically about argument interaction, b) clash – you delink my offense and can go for presumption as an out, key to education since questioning makes us realize assumptions and fairness since best arguments are found through comparison, c) reciprocity – the NC can become a functional NIB – if I concede your offense you win, but I have to beat back each argument under the NC before I can turn it since multiple conflicting obligations can trigger presummption, kills fairness since equal paths to the ballot ensures equitability

# Permissibility, Presumption and Skep Shells

Note: just read fairness

## Presumption and Permissibility Negate Bad

A: Debaters may not claim permissibility and presumption ground

B  
C:

Reciprocity – 3:1 skew since you can prove prohibition, permissibility or presumption, kills fairness since we don’t have equal paths to the ballot, especially bad since they’re qualitatively easier than obligation – a) permissibility shows doubt but doesn’t require proactive burden of proof, b) permissibility and presumption can be independent arguments – they don’t require link chains, kills fairness since easier paths to the ballot make it easier to win.

Clash – a) permissibility and presumption can be triggered b) you can go for any obligation in your later speech, means you can delink turns and aren’t bound to defend a specific piece of your advocac, c) permissibility/prohibition don’t require engagement with the aff since you can preclude with generics – combination is uniquely bad since the impact of permissibility/presumption triggers is closely linked so there’s no risk for me saying your permissibility trigger actually leads to presumption, kills education since questioning makes us realize flaws in ideas, and fairness since best arguments are chosen through comparison. Also kills strat – I don’t know what you defend; kills fairness since I need a strat to form a path to the ballot, and education since it makes us think critically about argument interaction

## Permissibility Negates Bad

A: Interpretation: The negative debater must defend only prohibition of the resolution

Violation: They try to negate the resolution without showing an obligation to \_\_\_\_\_\_ and instead uses permissibility.

Standards:

1. Reciprocity: a) If neg gets permissibility, they get a 2-1 structural advantage, since I have to defend an obligation while they can either show an obligation or that it is permissible, b) permissibility has the ability to turn into multiple a prioris triggered when a condition is satisfied – **And**, it is not sufficient to say that I have permissibility ground too, since permissibility logically flows neg so the ground is terrible; quality of ground is key to reciprocity since ground I have must enable me to win. Reciprocity is key to fairness since it gives both debaters an equal chance at winning – all other theory standards that link to fairness appeal to some notion of reciprocity, since they want to give each side an equal chance. Structural reciprocity cuts to the chase and therefore has the strongest internal link to fairness.
2. Clash: a) instead of comparing aff world to the neg world, it’s strategic for the neg to run a short NC that proves there is another permissible option, b) you preclude the aff on a higher layer since you do’t need to talk about topic, c) it gives the aff an incentive to try to capture the permissibility ground which devolves into args with no real world impact – key since that’s why in round discussion matters. Clash is key to education since questioning makes us realize assumptions and fairness since best arguments are chosen through comparison.

### A2 you could’ve read a different framework

1. I couldn’t have known this before the round started so it’s not predictable
2. terrible for education since it forces the AC to have a specific type of framework, decreasing breadth of framework knowledge
3. this gives an advantage, since they can win framework or go for permissibility – interp doesn’t solve abuse
4. you’ll go for these arguments anyway

### A2 You can Turn Permissibility

1. Extend that it is hardly possible for the aff to run permissibility, since it just logically goes neg. Best-case scenario, the aff is very behind on this debate since the ground is so poor, even if they can make arguments for it. Extend from the clash standard that this just exacerbates the educational problems, since the round comes down to a terrible debate over which side permissibility goes.
2. This doesn’t make it any better, since it still forces the round to come down to permissibility, which is one all or nothing issue. Whoever wins it has a huge advantage.

### A2 Textuality

This is only a starting point for the fairness of arguments – just since an argument is textual doesn’t mean it’s fair

### A2 Resolvability

1. there is always a risk that one side has proven an obligation to use their option
2. we can weigh the strength of violations under means based standards, meaning this is not true
3. not an issue if debaters are incentivized to avoid irresolveable debates, which leads to higher quality of rounds
4. Worst-case scenario, we can use presumption to evaluate the round if there is literally no offense. This is preferable to permissibility, since a) it only comes into play if there is literally no offense, which hardly ever occurs, and b) it is accessible by both sides, since either side can make arguments as to why you should presume aff or neg.

### A2 Win FW

1. This is still terrible for clash, since we have no opportunity for debate about the topic.
2. This is still structurally skewed, since the neg has the opportunity to go for contention level turns or framework, while I am forced to go for framework.
3. This requires that the AC framework be ends based, since otherwise permissibility still applies. This a) limits the types of frameworks possible, which is bad for philosophical education, and b) does not solve the problem, since the aff didn’t know they were going to have to run an ends based framework to avoid the permissibility debate before the round.

## Permissibility Negates Good

Counterinterpretation: The neg can prove the resolution false by proving that both options are permissible.

I meet.

Standards:

1. Resolvability: If we don’t have permissibility ground, there is no way to evaluate the round if neither debater wins an obligation to do something. This is the most unfair thing possible, since the round comes down to the flip of the coin.
2. Textuality: To negate means **to deny the truth of** (dictionary.com). If ought is defined as a moral obligation, the way that one can deny the truth of an obligation can be through permissibility. Ignoring this by artificially constraining the arguments that can serve to negate harms predictability, which is bad for fairness since entire neg strats can be predicated on their ability to show that both options are permissible, considering this is a textually accurate way to negate.

### A2 Reciprocity:

1. Aff can run permissibility arguments too
2. They can have an ends based framework and then just win the framework debate to avoid permissibility
3. Two levels of debate that the neg can go for is only true if debaters actually go for both an obligation and permissibility. My interp would be that you can only go for one or the other, and I only go for permissibility.

### A2 use some other way to evaluate:

1. Artificially making ways to evaluate it, such as saying we should default to util if both actions are permissible under a standard, or that we should make standards weighable even if it doesn’t make sense, are not philosophically justified or consistent with the framework’s intent. This harms education since we are just making false arguments about frameworks that wouldn’t really be accepted.
2. Using presumption instead of permissibility is a) educationally bankrupt – while permissibility is a real moral possibility, presumption is a debate-created construct, and b) has a lot of the same problems as permissibility, such as avoiding clash.

### A2 Clash

1. There is no reason that clash on the permissibility debate can’t be equally educational. We can discuss whether or not it should go aff or neg.
2. There is still clash on the framework debate – there’s no reason we have to have clash on the contention, and if that’s true, this argument is non-unique to permissibility, since a lot of people just debate framework and never answer contention arguments.
3. Permissibility still necessitates some contention level clash, since you have to show that there are violations on both sides or neither side.
4. I am still defending a certain system that the aff can criticize, I am just defending that it is permissible instead of obligatory.
5. There is no alternative to permissibility that allows for more clash.

## Multiple Skep Arguments

### Multiple Skep Arguments bad if permissibility

A: If debaters claim permissibility ground, they may not read multiple independent arguments for skepticism

B:

C:

Ground – skep’s comparatively easier since you don’t actively prove the truth of a theory AND get generics that you can recycle, you just must prove doubt in alt theories, but I can’t spend four minutes on one issue creating a [x]:1 structural skew since each argument is sufficient to negate since they prove the res is permissible and you claim permissibility ground– turning permissibility doesn’t solve since you can collapse to that for 5 minutes since I’ll undercover in the time crunched 1ar, kills reciprocity, key to fairness since equal paths to the ballot ensures equitability, and ground which is key to fairness since better paths to the ballot make it easier for you to win.

Time skew – each arg’s sufficient to negate so you can collapse to what I undercover for 6 minutes, creating a [1ar/# of skep args] time skew – key to fairness since all arguments can be traded linearly for time, and education since we critically engage instead of preventing opponents from answering arguments, also kills strat since I don’t know what you’ll go for, key to fairness since I need it to form a path to the ballot, and education since it makes us think about argument interaction

Clash – a) less in depth discussion of arguments if there’s multiple individual ones b) you can shift and delink my arguments – key to education since questioning makes us realize flaws in ideas, and fairness since best arguments are chosen through comparison

### Multiple Skep Arguments bad if permissibility & presumption

A: If debaters claim permissibility ground, they may not read multiple independent arguments for skepticism

B:

C:

Ground – skep’s comparatively easier since you don’t actively prove the truth of a theory AND get generics that you can recycle, you just must prove doubt in alt theories, but I can’t spend four minutes on one issue creating a [x]:1 structural skew since each argument is sufficient to negate since they prove the res is permissible and you claim permissibility ground– turning permissibility doesn’t solve since you can collapse to that for 5 minutes since I’ll undercover in the time crunched 1ar. Presumption ground makes it easier since you get access to arguments about how do don’t know certain concepts are true which can’t be proven or disproven so you can trigger presumption – kills reciprocity, key to fairness since equal paths to the ballot ensures equitability, and ground which is key to fairness since better paths to the ballot make it easier for you to win.

Time skew – each arg’s sufficient to negate so you can collapse to what I undercover for 6 minutes, creating a [1ar/# of skep args] time skew – key to fairness since all arguments can be traded linearly for time, and education since we critically engage instead of preventing opponents from answering arguments, also kills strat since I don’t know what you’ll go for, key to fairness since I need it to form a path to the ballot, and education since it makes us think about argument interaction

Real world education – presumption incentivizes inapplicable discussions that can’t be resolved; you’re incentivized to hide presumption triggers in skep args, kills education since our in round knowledge loses its value if we can’t use it

Clash – a) less in depth discussion of arguments if there’s multiple individual ones b) you can shift and delink my arguments, c) presumption creates incentive to make arguments impossible to engage– key to education since questioning makes us realize flaws in ideas, and fairness since best arguments are chosen through comparison

## Skep and Turns to the Aff Bad

A: If debaters claim permissibility ground and read multiple arguments proving that skepticism is true, they may not read turns to the aff

B  
C

Ground – skep’s comparatively easier since you don’t actively prove the truth of a theory, but provide doubt in others, but I can’t spend four minutes on one issue creating a [x]:1 structural skew since each argument is sufficient to negate since they prove the res is permissible and you claim permissibility ground, even if I beat this back you go for turns on the aff– turning permissibility doesn’t solve since you can collapse to that for 5 minutes since I’ll undercover in the time crunched 1ar, kills reciprocity, key to fairness since equal paths to the ballot ensures equitability, and ground which is key to fairness since better paths to the ballot make it easier for you to win.

Time skew – each arg’s sufficient to negate so you can collapse to what I undercover for 6 minutes, creating a [1ar/# of skep args] time skew; especially bad since I can’t group concepts – e.g. epistemic modesty to take out skep – key to fairness since all arguments can be traded linearly for time, and education since we critically engage instead of preventing opponents from answering arguments, also kills strat since I don’t know what you’ll go for, key to fairness since I need it to form a path to the ballot, and education since it makes us think about argument interaction

Clash – a) less in depth discussion of concepts if you hedge your bets on different places of the flow b) you can shift and delink my arguments – key to education since questioning makes us realize flaws in ideas, and fairness since best arguments are chosen through comparison

## Skep & Theory

### Skep, Theory & No RVI Bad

A: If debaters claim permissibility ground and read multiple arguments proving that skepticism is true, they may not read theory and deny Aff the RVI

B:

C:

Reciprocity – I have to beat back theory, but even if I do, each skep argument is sufficient for you but not me, I need to beat them back to access the aff AND I can’t leverage it since none of my offense is relevant so I have a massive time skew, kills fairness since all arguments can be traded linearly for time, and education since I can’t clash with your position, and this kills fairness since equal number of paths to the ballot ensures equitability.

Strat skew – you go for whatever I undercover since each argument’s sufficient– uplayering doesn't solve since you can dump on metatheory or 1ar theory in the 2n which is why I need this shell and you should ignore those dumps, or they can win the initial shell and weigh, key to fairness since I need a strat to form a path to the ballot, also education since it makes us think critically about argument interaction. This also kills clash since shiftiness prevents engagement, key to education since questioning makes us realize flaws in our ideas, and fairness since better debaters compare arguments.

### If Skep & Theory Must Explicity State Theory > Skep

A: If debaters read arguments for skepticism and theoretical arguments, they must explicitly clarify in the form of a text whether skepticism or theory functions on a higher layer

B:  
C:

Strat skew: Skep says we don’t have obligations but theory says the judge is obligated to vote on theory so you can go for either arg in the 2n – I don’t know how to allocate time if your arguments aren’t implicated, if I win theory but under allocate on skep, you can say skep takes out theory for 6 minutes and say arguments are implicit in the NC which takes out new 2ar responses, kills fairness since I need a strat to form a path to the ballot, also education since strat makes us think about argument interaction. AND, ability to be shifty kills clash – key to education since questioning makes us realize flaws in assumptions, and fairness since better debaters compare arguments.

Preempts:

CX doesn’t solve

1. many judges don’t flow or pay attention to CX – makes the round irresolveable since they don’t understand how to evaluate making decisions arbitrary
2. time skew – you understand arg function earlier on, key since greater prep time means you can think of better arguments
3. No abuse on spec – you should have a spike that says you will clarify all spec concerns in CX
4. Unverifiable – we don’t know if you’d have spec-ed if I asked

## If Skep 🡪 Must read an alternative normative theory

A: If debaters read skeptical arguments, they must read an alternative normative theory that attempts to solve for skeptical concerns

B:

Ground – skep’s comparatively easier since 1) you don’t actively prove the truth of a theory but just prove doubt in alternate theories, 2) you get generics you can recycle on any topic, 3) risk of offense matters for you but not me, kills fairness since better ground means its easier for you to win, 4) comparatively better access to lit since most solutions to skep claim to provide the best answer, not completely solve

Wood, Allen. Fichte’s Intersubjective. <http://web.stanford.edu/~allenw/webpapers/FichteIntersubjective.pdf> NP 8/31/15.

Of course a strategy of this kind is notoriously problematic, and arguments along these lines are famously difficult to execute. Philosophers outside the Kantian tradition have had no difficulty coming up with reasons for doubting not only particular transcendental arguments for such ambitious conclusions, but even the entire enterprise of transcendental philosophy itself. This might make it seem like a rather pointless exercise to provide such answers to skepticism, since it is easy enough for anyone tempted by skeptical doubts in the first place to renew them by challenging the transcendental procedure. But this objection ignores the fact that for transcendental philosophy the real point was never merely to have an answer to skepticism, but rather to use this way of answering skepticism in order to provide insight into the nature of the fundamental concepts about which we are inquiring, and developing a new and revolutionary theory of the relationships between them. Skepticism can always persist, if it is stubborn enough. The value of skepticism to the non-skeptic is that it provides a challenge to our way of thinking about our fundamental concepts, and thus possibly an incitement to think about them differently. This is the way the transcendental philosopher 13 really sees the matter. In the present case, I regard the real point of Fichte’s transcendental approach to intersubjectivity as helping us develop an entirely new concept of mind, finding a way out of the Cartesian conception that we all find so unsatisfactory and yet also so difficult not relapse into (at least on our bad days).

Also means that providing an alt theory that solves skep gives equal ground since we both have equal burdens of proof. Kills fairness since ground shapes ability to argue and win; if yours is higher quality the round’s harder, and education since we get access to high quality arguments that let us compare positions.

Real world education – skep can’t guide how we act by definition but normative theories do, key since it’s how in round concerns are applied later – o/w on probability since it’s definitive by nature of picking a moral theory that it’s found to best guide action; we don’t know if skep will lead to your benefits later on

[Fairness]

# Counterplan Shells: “A Fruitful Place to Read Theory” – Rahul Gosain

## Competition

### Counterplans must be mutually exclusive

A: Counterplans must compete through mutual exclusivity

B:

C:

Prep skew – without competition there’s an infinite number of policies to prep responses to and I can’t leverage the aff; mutual exclusivity solves since it makes us focus on things intrinsic to the aff; key to fairness since preparation shapes ability to generate efficient high quality in round arguments, which are also best for education

Clash – your counterplan can moot the whole aff and then you generate a marginal net benefit, kills fairness since best arguments are chosen through comparison not preclusion, and education since clash makes us question assumptions

Reciprocity – if I make intrinsicness perms in the 1a that solve your disads I’ll lose theory but you can read counterplans that solve the aff; key to fairness since equal pathways to the ballot ensures equitability; also *intrinsicness perms are bad since we shift out of each others disadvantages and never clash every speech so whoever speaks last wins*

Ground – the CP moots the whole aff and I can’t leverage; all you need is risk of a turn, kills fairness since higher quality ground means it’s easier to win

### C/I: Advantage Counterplans Good

A: Debaters may read advantage counterplans

B  
C:

Policymaking education – a) advantage counterplans make us think about the best policies. B) policymakers view a full range of alternatives, key to education since abstract ideals are made applicable, also fairness since you get access to best reasons for doing the aff but I can’t point out the plan’s biggest disadvantages – means you get access to try or die framing so have a much lower solvency standard. This is the most educational part of debate

Esberg and Sagan[[3]](#footnote-3):

These government or quasi-government think tank simulations often provide very similar lessons for high-level players as are learned by **students in educational simulations**. Government participants learn about the **importance of understanding foreign perspectives,** the need to practice internal coordination, and the necessity to compromise and coordinate with other governments in negotiations and crises. During the Cold War, political scientist Robert Mandel noted how **crisis exercises and war games forced government officials to overcome ‘‘bureaucratic myopia,’’ moving beyond their normal organizational roles and** **thinking more creatively** about how others might react in a crisis or conflict.6 **The** **skills** of imagination and the subsequent ability to predict foreign interests and reactions **remain** **critical for real-world foreign policy makers**. For example, simulations of the Iranian nuclear crisis\*held in 2009 and 2010 at the Brookings Institution’s Saban Center and at Harvard University’s Belfer Center, and involving former US senior officials and regional experts\*highlighted the dangers of misunderstanding foreign governments’ preferences and misinterpreting their subsequent behavior. In both simulations, the primary criticism of the US negotiating team lay in a failure to predict accurately how other states, both allies and adversaries, would behave in response to US policy initiatives.7 By university age, students often have a pre-defined view of international affairs, and the literature on simulations in education has long emphasized how such exercises **force students to challenge their assumptions** **about how** other governments behave and how their own **government works**.8 Since simulations became more common as a teaching tool in the late 1950s, **educational literature has expounded on their benefits**, from encouraging engagement by **breaking from the typical lecture format**, **to improving communication skills**, to promoting teamwork.9 More broadly, simulations can deepen understanding by asking students to **link fact and theory**, providing a context for facts while bringing theory into the realm of practice.10 These exercises are particularly valuable in teaching international affairs for many of the same reasons they are useful for policy makers: they force participants to ‘‘grapple with the issues arising from a world in flux.’’11 Simulations have been used successfully to teach students about such disparate topics as European politics, the Kashmir crisis, and US response to the mass killings in Darfur.12 **Role-playing exercises** certainly encourage students to learn political and technical facts\* but they learn them in a **more active style**. Rather than sitting in a classroom and merely receiving knowledge, students actively research ‘‘their’’ government’s positions and actively argue, brief, and negotiate with others.13 Facts can change quickly; simulations teach students how to contextualize and act on information.14

Clash – you arbitrarily limit ways to question the aff since parts of it are untouchable, kills fairness since best arguments are chosen through comparison, and education since we clash forces us to question assumptions

*Ground – you pick and frontline a parametricized advocacy and can spend time prepping out the limited number of mutually exclusive counterplans so are always at a prep advantage; key since I need high quality ground to form a path to the ballot; also impact turns your predictability offense since it’s the only way for me to check back infinite aff prep time.*

N/A – u get intrinsic perms

N/A – you can perm it and have reasons that things that are intrinsic to the aff are important

T – if your advantages aren’t intrinsic to the aff then your position’s shitty; reading things like deont solves abuse on the CP

## Mult CPs Bad

A: Debaters may not read multiple counterplans

B:

C: Limits – you get access to an unlimited combination of counterplans but I can’t predict how they work in tandem – kills a) predictability – there’s an expansive number of positions I have to prep, kills fairness since you have access to higher quality pre round argument, also education since I don’ t learn about biggest flaws with your advocacy, b) clash – expansive topics mean we’re less knowledgeable on certain issues so we discuss topics in less depth, keyto education since in depth discussion lets us best understand concepts and think critically

Policymaking education – combinations of counterplans might not be feasible or have basis in the lit, kills education since policymaking lets us learn how to apply abstract ideals to make concrete change, and kills fairness since a large part of the topic lit is about policymaking so I don’t have access to the best arguments to indict your position

Reciprocity – I get the plan but you get multiple potential policies, and you can pick and choose best parts of each, kills fairness since equal paths to the ballot ensure equity

### No neg fiat

1. Interp: the neg must defend the status quo.
2. Violatino:
3. Standards
   1. Predictability- I’m constrained by the rez but neg fiat increases the caselist to infinity. I can’t predict the CP so my analytic responses will always take backseat to your carded frontlines- which is key to fairness because I can’t engage your offense.
   2. Division of ground- neg fiat allows you to pick the most desirable CP’s and mix and match the best parts to create a near perfect advocacy. I’m constrained by actual policies in the lit so you have a qualitative ground advantage.
   3. Textuality – resolved: makes aff a policy; you just ‘negate’ the resolution which means you can read disadvantages to the aff but don’t get your own policy, key since textuality is a gateway issue which determines which arguments affirm or negate, making the round resolveable and enabling winners and losers

## Spec Status

A: If the negative debater reads a counterplan, they must specify the status in the form of a delineated text in the 1NC

B:

C:

Strat skew – I don’t know how to allocate time on the CP since it’s status shapes its relevance, often novices don’t know status of counterplans is a consideration so can’t win, key to fairness since strat is the only way for arguments to form a path to the ballot, also education since it lets us think critically about argument interaction, also means less experienced debaters leave the activity and don’t get access to in round education

Time skew – you know the status of the CP going into your speech and can allocate time accordingly but I can’t know until CX, giving you at least a 7 minute prep advantage, key to fairness since prep time grants access to better strategies and arguments, and education since we don’t discuss biggest weaknesses with positions with less time to realize their flaws.

And, specing in the 1N in the form of a text is preferable to cx, a) stable advocacy – many judges don’t flow CX so can’t bind them, b) resolvability – we might understand what they say differently – most resolvable if we can refer to a text, resolvability is key to fairness since otherwise judges will arbitrate based on personal preferences not who debates better, also kills education since people can’t make arguments if there’s no metric for comparison c) people flip-flop on status in CX which wastes time and prevents CX from being used effectively – a text binds them to an advocacy, d) if I forget to ask then I can’t form a strat in my speech, d) clarity – people are vague in cx but it’s harder to pinpoint than a text

## Perms

### Must write out perm text

1. If the affirmative debater reads a permutation to a [counterplan/kritk] in the 1AR, they must have the entirety of the perm text written down before it is read in their speech.
2. They read [x] perm
3. Stable advocacy- perms change the advocacy from what it originally was, so a text is necessary to give me something stable that I can hold you to throughout the round. Otherwise the 2AR has huge leeway in reclarifying the advocacy to avoid disads- abuse is supercharged since I don’t have a 3NR to check back. Especially key since debaters usually read multiple perms- they’re short, game over args so a text ensures you win based on merit, not lack of clarity. Key to education because it makes you responsible for the merits of your arguments. Key to fairness- I can’t engage unless I know what you defend. Writing it down after doesn’t solve:

small modifications in the perm text can change the way the entire advocacy functions

you’re incentivized to make your perm better than it was when you originally read it

### Severance Bad

A: The affirmative must defend the advocacy presented in the AC unconditionally for the entire round

B  
C  
Stable advocacy – you don’t have one if you can sever from parts of it, kills a) clash – you delink my best arguments; kills fairness since best arguments are chosen through comparison not preclusion and education since clash makes us question assumptions b) strat skew – I can’t form a path to the ballot if I don’t know what I’ll have to disprove in the 2N, kills fairness since I need a strat to have a path to the ballot, and kills education since I can’t think critically about how arguments interact c) resolvability – unclear what you defend for the whole round, kills fairness since judges decide based on personal preference instead of merit

RWE – a) you don’t become well researched on defending all of your advocacy if you can shift out, b) you delink all potential counterplans since competition is nullified when you shift advocacies – key to education since it enables knowledge to be applicable later

Reciprocity – I must disprove a multitude of parts of the aff advocacy instead of your entire position since you can shift out of specific turns, key to fairness since it ensures equitable paths to the ballot

### Time frame perms bad

A: Debaters may not read perms that claim that we ought to do the counterplan after we do the aff

B: They read a time frame perm

C:

Clash – you don’t substantively engage the counterplan since you can co-opt it by saying it’s possible later, key to fairness since best arguments are chosen through comparison not preclusion and education since we realize benefits and flaws of our ideas through clash

RWE – if you can’t time frame perm we must talk about policy tradeoffs instead of ways it’s feasible to do both – key to education since policymaking lets us apply abstract ideals to real situations

Ground – yours explodes since I must prep reasons that they aff’s a good idea and AND I must prep disads to every hypothetical time the counterplan’s done so it’s easier for you to prep, key to fairness since easier paths to the ballot make it easier to win, also education since we both can express our ideas

Stable advocacy – do the aff then the counterplan’s vague since you can shift what that means and how long it takes for the aff to happen, key to fairness since you can ditch out of my arguments and not substantively engage killing clash, also kills reciprocity since you have infinite possible advocacies in any moment

Reciprocity – I must prove it’s bad to do the aff unconditionally, but you can say the counterplan’s a good idea sometimes, key to fairness since equal paths to the ballot ensures equitability

### Intrinsic Perms Bad

A: The affirmative debater may not add on additional planks in the 1ar that are not intrinsic to the initial aff advocacy (To clarify: you may not read intrinsic perms).

B: The plan text is \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, and in the 1a you say we should \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ in order to solve \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.   
C:

Stable advocacy – you don't have one if you can change what you defend in the 1a, means there’s a) strat skew – I don’t know what to form a strat against if I don’t know what you’ll defend for the round, key to fairness since strat’s how we form a path to the ballot, also education since it lets us think critically about argument interaction, b) time skew – 1ar restart nullifies the NC so you have 7 minutes to defend the new aff, but I get 6 to read disadvantages and also can’t rebuild them, key to fairness since otherwise arguments are won since I don’t have time to answer them, and education since you spread me out instead of engaging my position

Clash – you shift out of disadvantages my adding planks, key to fairness since better debaters engage instead of precluding, and education since questioning makes us realize flaws in our beliefs

Reciprocity – you just add planks to solve disadvantages to your advocacy but I can’t do the same since the debate becomes irresolvable since we solve each other’s disadvantages, kills fairness since reciprocity ensures equitability and resolvability ensures debates are determined based on merit not judge preference

Policymaking education – a) you don’t choose the best policy from the getgo since you can change the aff throughout the round, b) you can defend policies that aren’t feasible by adding random planks, key to education since it lets us apply abstract ideals to concrete situations, also fairness since you get better ground than me by fiating ideal policies – major indicts are feasibility but I don’t get access to those flaws with the position

## PIC Shells

### Disclose PIC on the wiki

A: Debaters must disclose PICs on the NDCA LD Wiki under their own name

B:

C: Predictability – there are infinite parts of the aff you can sever from so I don’t know what to prep, kills fairness since you et efficient pre round responses to my position while I have less time to realize flaws of yours, and education since I can’t substantively engage the PIC if I don’t understand it as well – disclosure lets me a) prep it instead of going for generics, b) focus the aff on arguments that clash directly with it, key to education since argument comparison lets us question beliefs and fairness since best arguments are chosen through comparison.

### Disclose PIC if Plan Disclosed

A: Debaters must disclose PICs on the NDCA LD Wiki under their own name if the affirmative debater disclosed their advocacy text

B:

C: Predictability – there are infinite parts of the aff you can sever from so I don’t know what to prep, kills fairness since you have better ability to prepare efficient pre round responses to my position while I have less time to realize flaws of yours, and education since I can’t substantively engage the PIC if I don’t understand it as well. Next substantive engagement – disclosure lets me a) prep it instead of going for generics, b) focus the aff on arguments that clash directly with it, key to education since argument comparison lets us question beliefs and fairness since best arguments are chosen through comparison. Next strat skew – you can nullify all of the aff if you PIC out of something small – key to fairness since strat is key for arguments to form a path to the ballot. Next reciprocity – you had access to my advocacy pre round but I didn’t have access to yours giving you better ability to prep and strategize, kills fairness since reciprocal ability to make arguments shapes equitable ballot access.

### Word PIC Solvency Advocate

1. If debaters read a word PIC, they must provide a solvency advocate. (To clarify: this means that they must provide someone in the topic literature who specifically advocates that the aff must be done but we must change a specific word in the aff to an alternate one. Providing an author who says that a) we should pass the policy using a specific word, or b) the specific word is bad, is not sufficient to meet the interp).
   1. Predictability – there’s lots of synonyms for words and some might be comparatively better but I don’t know what’s in the lit if no one advocates a shift, key to fairness since I need access to a variety of disadvantages for your position, you’ll have better arguments if you have more prep time, also education since we discuss biggest problems with positions
   2. Ground – you can fiat anything even if it’s not feasible; e.g. we might not be able to pass a policy using certain rhetoric, kills fairness since you have access to a greater variety of high quality positions, and education since we don’t engage on issues that have policy application
   3. Strat skew – if you don't have a solvency advocate that clarifies what switching words means you delink my turns in later speeches, key to fairness since I need a path to the ballot to win, and education since coherent strats enable best idea comparison, also means there’s no clash, killing education since it forces us to question assumptions.

# Disad Shells

### Plan Roll Back Bad

A: The negative debater may not read disadvantages that claim that the plan will be rolled back in the future

B:

C:

Limits – res becomes expansive if I have to prove passing the plan in a given moment’s a good idea and a generally good principle since every second has a different resolution, key to a) predictability – unlimited topics make us less familiar with arguments, key to fairness since it gives access to high quality pre round arguments instead of luck, also education since we engage with adequate knowledge on topics b) clash – underlimited topics mean we just go for lots of preclusion instead of engagement, key to education since we realize flaws in ideas by questioning them, and fairness since best arguments are chosen through comparison

Reciprocity – I must prove that the plan is a good principle and good in this moment since you can go for Ks that criticize assumptions of the aff, but also go for delay cps that say we do it later, key to fairness since it ensures equitability, also kills strat since I have to spend the aff preempting potential strategies that you might not go for, key to fairness since strat formation lets me form a path to the ballot, and education since it lets us think about argument interaction, also kills clash since you shift out of arguments, and means you’re at a time advantage since you control framing, kills fairness since you have a greater amount of time to make good arguments

# Neg Spec Shells

### If aff has an advocacy text, neg must read one as well

1. If the affirmative debater provides a text in the AC clarifying their advocacy, the negative debater must have an advocacy text that clarifies their position. (To clarify: Neg may not solely say “I negate,” rather they must clarify at least one world they defend, or read a truth testing paradigm).
2. 1. Reciprocity – aff has one so you know what I defend, I’m at a disadvantage if yours is unclear – key to fairness since equal paths to the ballot ensures equity
   2. Stable advocacy – you can delink turns by shifting what you defend; e.g. I could think squo’s the norm but they’d disagree. Impacts, a) strat skew – I must spend extra time explaining why they can’t shift out of links and can only realize best strat in the 2a, kills fairness since I need a ballot path to win, also education since we think about argument interaction, b) clash – you delink turns – kills education since questioning makes us realize assumptions, also fairness since best arguments are picked through comparison, c) time skew – you nullify speech time – key since all arguments can be traded linearly for time, d) judge intervention – relies on judge paradigm about what no text means – kills strat and clash since we don’t know how positions really interact, also fairness since judges vote off personal preferences, not better debating

And – CX doesn’t solve: a) time skew – vagueness in advocacy means you get infinite pre round prep to determine your position but I can’t prep during speech which also kills my CX time since I can’t question nuances of the position if I don’t understand it so I’m at a disadvantage since it’s harder to engage, outweighs time reading your advocacy in the 1AC-that takes seconds whereas a line of questioning can last minutes, b) resolvability – many judges don’t flow CX or do badly so advocacy specificities which can be complex aren’t caught and you can be shifty later

### Neg must have an advocacy text

1. Neg must have an advocacy text
2. The standard is stable advocacy – you can delink turns by shifting what you defend; e.g. I could think squo’s the norm but they’d disagree. Impacts, a) strat skew – I must spend extra time explaining why they can’t shift out of links and can only realize best strat in the 2a, kills fairness since I need a ballot path to win, also education since we think about argument interaction, b) clash – you delink turns – kills education since questioning makes us realize assumptions, also fairness since best arguments are picked through comparison, c) time skew – you nullify speech time – key since all arguments can be traded linearly for time, d) judge intervention – relies on judge paradigm about what no text means – kills strat and clash since we don’t know how positions really interact, also fairness since judges vote off personal preferences, not better debating

And – CX doesn’t solve: a) time skew – vagueness in advocacy means you get infinite pre round prep to determine your position but I can’t prep during speech which also kills my CX time since I can’t question nuances of the position if I don’t understand it so I’m at a disadvantage since it’s harder to engage, outweighs time reading your advocacy in the 1AC-that takes seconds whereas a line of questioning can last minutes, b) resolvability – many judges don’t flow CX or do badly so advocacy specificities which can be complex aren’t caught and you can be shifty later

# K Shells

### Floating PIKs Bad

A: If criticizing the representation of the Aff, debaters must claim that the plan is impossible in the world of the alt

B:

C:

1. Strat skew – unclear whether you defend the plan so my time allocation will be inaccurate since I don’t know what to compare the aff against, key to fairness since strat makes arguments form a path to the ballot.

2. Clash– 1) you can shift out of my arguments based on what I undercover, 2) you coopt the majority of the aff and only have to answer specific parts, kills fairness since shiftiness make the round easier for you since you don’t have to answer everything, also education since substantive argument comparison lets us realize argument flaws.

3. Policymaking education – talking about reps kills it since we don’t talk about the aff, if what I said was that bad then weighing it’s no loss to you and I should get access to the policy, key to education since policies let us contextualize abstract concepts.

4. Topic education – you can recycle the same Ks evading topic discussion – key since it lets us discuss real world issues.

5. Reciprocity – 2-1 skew – I need to prove aff policy is good and my representations are but you can go for either, kills fairness since reciprocity means we have equal paths to the ballot

### If K and Theory, Must Weigh

A. if the negative reads a theory or T shell, and a prefiat criticism with a distinct role of the ballot, they must explicitly delineate which layer comes first.

B.

C. Strat skew- these arguments are functionally aprioris because they are two completely independent links on the higher layer- offense on theory has no interaction with offense on the kritik so I can’t leverage any arguments I make in the 1AR against both layers. They can kick my best responses to either, which A. decreases clash and critical thinking B. turns their criticism- proves it’s a gimmick they don’t care about, which skews 1AR time allocation and strategy. Saying I can weigh is nonsense- the 6 minute 2NR means they can collapse to whatever he’s ahead on and then go for both, and it’s always net preferable under competing interps to weigh for me. Strategy is key to fairness because I can’t win the round without a reasonable understanding of it.

### Must disclose ROTB

A. if the negative reads an alternate role of the ballot, they must disclose the role of the ballot text on the NDCA LD wiki at least thirty minutes before the round.

B.

C. engagement. There are hundreds of different ways we can frame how the debate round ought to be evaluated-no way for me to predict which one you will warrant. Disclosure 30 minutes before is key since a) I can cut cards that justify offense underneath the role of the ballot-key to fairness since you’ll always have a prep advantage if you know the paradigm for the round and I don’t-also key to education since I allow nuanced clash underneath the role of the ballot that determines what offense is most relevant, b) I can cut cards that defend the aff’s approach against yours, that’s key since it allows us to have a debate about which method is better that isn’t fundamentally biased towards you. Also independently key to jurisdiction-the ballot asks you who did the better debating so if you pick the wrong role of the ballot then you’ve decided the round incorrectly-clash over this issue in particular is key.

### Imx justified ROTB bad

A. debaters must link their role of the ballot warrants to a normative theory that determines what counts as good and bad. To clarify, they may not say that the role of the ballot prevents x without warranting why x is normatively bad.

B.

C. ground-making assertions without justifying why certain things are good and bad kills my ground since I don’t know how to link turns to the role of the ballot-there is no mechanism I can appeal to that warrants what counts as offense in the first place. *Supercharged by the fact that the role of the ballot excludes my framework, there is no way to actually weigh offense in the round*. Impacts: A. kills fairness since you’re the only one with offense left, B. causes intervention since just has to randomly pick one side without any basis-that means the round isn’t decided on the better debating but rather arbitrary things which also kills fairness. C. link turns the role of the ballot since otherwise we make assumptions that hurt the alternative you want to empower since it seems unjustified to people.

### Rejection Alts Bad

A: When criticizing an aspect of the affirmative, debaters may not read an alternative that claims that we ought to reject the [aff/aff ideology/etc.] Rather, they must read an advocate for an alternative policy.

B:

C:  
Clash – you delink my turns since you fiat we get rid of something bad but we don't discuss solutions; easiest ground is in pointing out existence of a problem, solvency is where discussion exists so rejection means you have 0% chance of solving the Ks harms– key to fairness since better debaters win by proving their arguments are comparatively better, and education since it makes questioning beliefs makes us realize their flaws

RWE – Rejection causes us to be lost in abstractions inhibiting us from resolving real world problems

Bryant 12**[[4]](#footnote-4)**

What I wonder is just what we’re supposed to do even if all of this is true? What, given existing conditions, are we to do if all of this is right? At least green consumerism, conservation, resource management, and things like carbon trading are engaging in activities that are making real differences. From this passage– and maybe the entire text would disabuse me of this conclusion –it sounds like we are to reject all of these interventions because they remain tied to a capitalist model of production that the author (and myself) find abhorrent. The idea seems to be that if we endorse these things we are tainting our hands and would therefore do well to reject them altogether. The problem as I see it is that this is the worst sort of abstraction (in the Marxist sense) and wishful thinking. Within a Marxo-Hegelian context, a thought is abstract when it ignores all of the mediations in which a thing is embedded. For example, I understand a robust tree abstractly when I attribute its robustness, say, to its genetics alone, ignoring the complex relations to its soil, the air, sunshine, rainfall, etc., that also allowed it to grow robustly in this way. This is the sort of critique we’re always leveling against the neoliberals. They are abstract thinkers. In their doxa that individuals are entirely responsible for themselves and that they completely make themselves by pulling themselves up by their bootstraps, neoliberals ignore all the mediations belonging to the social and material context in which human beings develop that play a role in determining the vectors of their life. They ignore, for example, that George W. Bush grew up in a family that was highly connected to the world of business and government and that this gave him opportunities that someone living in a remote region of Alaska in a very different material infrastructure and set of family relations does not have. To think concretely is to engage in a cartography of these mediations, a mapping of these networks, from circumstance to circumstance (what I call an “onto-cartography”). It is to map assemblages, networks, or ecologies in the constitution of entities. Unfortunately, the academic left falls prey to its own form of abstraction. It’s good at carrying out critiques that denounce various social formations, yet very poor at proposing any sort of realistic constructions of alternatives. This because it thinks abstractly in its own way, ignor[es]ing how networks, assemblages, structures, or regimes of attraction would have to be remade to create a workable alternative. Here I’m reminded by the “underpants gnomes” depicted in South Park:

Our problem is that we seem perpetually stuck at phase 1 without ever explaining what is to be done at phase 2. Often the critiques articulated at phase 1 are right, but there are nonetheless all sorts of problems with those critiques nonetheless. In order to reach phase 3, we have to produce new collectives. In order for new collectives to be produced, people need to be able to hear and understand the critiques developed at phase 1. Yet this is where everything begins to fall apart. Even though these critiques are often right, we express them in ways that only an academic with a PhD in critical theory and post-structural theory can understand. How exactly is Adorno to produce an effect in the world if only PhD’s in the humanities can understand him? Who are these things for? We seem to always ignore these things and then look down our noses with disdain at the Naomi Kleins and David Graebers of the world. To make matters worse, we publish our work in expensive academic journals that only universities can afford, with presses that don’t have a wide distribution, and give our talks at expensive hotels at academic conferences attended only by other academics. Again, who are these things for? Is it an accident that so many activists look away from these things with contempt, thinking their more about an academic industry and tenure, than producing change in the world? If a tree falls in a forest and no one is there to hear it, it doesn’t make a sound! Seriously dudes and dudettes, what are you doing? But finally, and worst of all, us Marxists and anarchists all too often act like assholes. We denounce others, we condemn them, we berate them for not engaging with the questions we want to engage with, and we vilify them when they don’t embrace every bit of the doxa that we endorse. We are every bit as off-putting and unpleasant as the fundamentalist minister or the priest of the inquisition (have people yet understood that Deleuze and Guattari’s Anti-Oedipus was a critique of the French communist party system and the Stalinist party system, and the horrific passions that arise out of parties and identifications in general?). This type of “revolutionary” is the greatest friend of the reactionary and capitalist because they do more to drive people into the embrace of reigning ideology than to undermine reigning ideology. These are the people that keep Rush Limbaugh in business. Well done! But this isn’t where our most serious shortcomings lie. Our most serious shortcomings are to be found at phase 2. We almost never make concrete proposals for how things ought to be restructured, for what new material infrastructures and semiotic fields need to be produced, and when we do, our critique-intoxicated cynics and skeptics immediately jump in with an analysis of all the ways in which these things contain dirty secrets, ugly motives, and are doomed to fail. How, I wonder, are we to do anything at all when we have no concrete proposals? We live on a planet of 6 billion people. These 6 billion people are dependent on a certain network of production and distribution to meet the needs of their consumption. That network of production and distribution does involve the extraction of resources, the production of food, the maintenance of paths of transit and communication, the disposal of waste, the building of shelters, the distribution of medicines, etc., etc., etc.

Key to education since applicability outside of debate is why we care about in round education – also matters under your role of the ballot since [X ROTB] requires that we care about [\_\_\_\_]

Reciprocity – comparative level of proof is different since it’s easier to recognize oppression is bad then solve it, key to fairness since we need equal paths to the ballot to have equal ability to win

**Trix**

Extend the clash standard: solvency is where discussion exists so rejection means you have 0% chance of solving the Ks harms; means there’s always a risk of offense of me solving the Ks harms since I take action, but your alt fails 100% of the time

### Link of Omission Bad

1. Debaters may not read kritiks where the violation is something that the affirmative failed to do.
2. 1. *Culpability* – there’s an infinite number of things it would be preferable for me to have done in the aff so I’m always at a disadvantage on theory. Culpability is key a) I didn’t make the round abusive so dropping me is disproportionate, b) can’t function to deter certain practicesif I’ll lose regardless of my in round strat – norms setting outweighs, a) longevity since it impacts all future rounds, b) scope since it impacts the debate community, and c) magnitude since the round starts out maximally fair or educational instead of attempting to make up for abuse halfway through
   2. *Predictability* – infinite number of things it would be better for me to spec so I can never prep to engage the K, key to fairness since predictability constrains ability to make high quality arguments and form a path to the ballot, also education since you can shift out of substantive topical debate which lets us learn about real world conflicts
   3. *Substantive education* – links of omssion mean that I have to spend the whole aff speaking ot a variety of random issues to get out of linking so we never debate the topic – kills education since topics give us knowledge on real world issues; also means there’s a disad to counterinterps; even if omitting is bad, I can’t speak to everything so it’s net preferable you ask
   4. *Critical education* – specing in the AC trades off with time spent developing complex arguments since you’ll want me to clarify everything which is why CX exists so you’re the worse debater if you didn’t check since you don’t understand the function of different parts of the round, key to education since it forces us to question assumptions
   5. *Clash* – you can shift out of engaging the Aff by uplayering instead of asking me to clarify meaning of arguments – key to education since it lets us realize our assumptions, and fairness since best arguments are chosen through comparison.

### Situational Advantages Bad

1. Debaters may not claim theoretical or substantive advantages because of their situation outside of a debate round. This includes but is not limited to things like being from a small school or being the only debater from their school.
2. Violation
3. Standards – 1) resolvability- round devolves into competing unverifiable assertions -- forces judge intervention since there’s no brightline to determine truth or legitimacy of these claims – key to fairness since it ensures the round is evaluated objectively, also education since we only think critically when we understand argument interaction. 2) it’s always net preferable to judge the round on merits of argumentation because there is no reasonable brightline for what is a proportional compensation- we don’t know if presumption or permissibility ground under or overcompensates for you having less resources. Allows you to claim advantages that make the round more difficult for me so it’s key to fairness.
4. voter- fairness, debate’s a competitive activity so no debater should have an advantage. Drop the debater 1) The round is skewed- I invested time and altered my strat to check abuse, so you can’t return to substance 2) reject the arg is no punishment- you sever and just collapse on a new issue in the next speech. 3) deterrence – empirically proven by the decline of aprioris, also reject the arg doesn’t deter on this shell since it’s a 1 sentence spike, no time investment for you. Use competing interps 1. Reasonability either a) causes judge intervention because the judge arbitratily asserts a brightline b) collpases to competing interps because we end up debating the brightline. 2. Competing interps fosters better norms by encouraging the fairest rule. 3. Reasonability forces race to the bottom by encouraging debaters to abuse the activity and get away with defense. NO RVI-

# Misc

### Cant Read Contradictory Args

1. Interp: debaters may not read contradictory arguments. (To clarify: both of the arguments must be able to logically coexist)
2. Violation:
3. Standards
   1. Strat Skew – I have to split my time to 2 minutes on each issue since the neg can go for either conclusion whereas the 2NR can sit on the argument I undercover for 6 min – makes it impossible to affirm by exacerbating the time skew
   2. Logical consistency – making contradictory args just for a strategic advantage is an intellectually bankrupt practice that doesn’t reward defending merits of your arguments which proves even if you’re reading more args there’s no clash and no education

### Must Read a Standard Text

A: Debaters must read a standard text

B:

C:

Stable advocacy – you have no framework you’re bound to defend, kills a) clash – you can piece together framework arguments to implicate framework’s meaning to get out of indicts and offense, you’re also incentivized to write an incoherent framework that can mean different things since I can’t point that out if you’re not held to one conclusion, kills education since questioning makes us realize flaws in ideas, and fairness since best arguments are chosen through comparison, also phil education if your framework’s incoherent – key to education since it shapes how we decide to act b) strat skew – I can’t form a strat if I don’t understand your position, key to fairness since it’s how I form a path to the ballot, and education since it makes us think critically about argument interaction, c) resolvablity – unclear how aff evaluates offense, kills fairness since judges vote randomly not on merit. C) time skew – you get infinite pre round prep to understand framework but I have to wait until after speeh

AND – a text’s preferable to CX

1. Resolvability – 1) many judges don’t flow, 2) debaters can be vague, 3) framework texts can be long, 4) we don’t know if you’d have spec-ed in CX so it’s not verifiable
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